

**PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD**  
Effective October 1, 2003

Application or Dockets Number

10/500316

**CLAIMS AS FILED - PART I**

	(Column 1)	(Column 2)
TOTAL CLAIMS		
FOR	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CHARGEABLE CLAIMS	21 minus 20 =	1
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	2 minus 3 =	
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT <input type="checkbox"/>		

\* If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2

**CLAIMS AS AMENDED - PART II**

	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
AMENDMENT A	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	21 Minus	21	
Independent	2 Minus	3	
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM <input type="checkbox"/>			

SMALL ENTITY TYPE ☐

OR OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY

RATE	FEE	OR	RATE	FEE
BASIC FEE		OR	BASIC FEE	920
XS 9=		OR	XS18=	18
X43=		OR	X86=	
+145=		OR	+290=	
TOTAL		OR	TOTAL	938

SMALL ENTITY OR

OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY

RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE	OR	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
XS 9=		OR	XS18=	
X43=		OR	X86=	
+145=		OR	+290=	
TOTAL ADDIT. FEE		OR	TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	

RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE	OR	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
XS 9=		OR	XS18=	150
X43=		OR	X86=	200
+145=		OR	+290=	
TOTAL ADDIT. FEE		OR	TOTAL ADDIT. FEE	350

4-1306

	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
AMENDMENT B	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total	24 Minus	21	3
Independent	4 Minus	3	1
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM <input type="checkbox"/>			

	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)
AMENDMENT C	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
Total			
Independent			
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM <input type="checkbox"/>			

\* If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.

\* If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20."

\* If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3."

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
- Sales Receipt -

05/01/2006 CQUEEN 00000003 191800 10500316

01 FC:1202	150.00 DA
02 FC:1201	200.00 DA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on or before the date shown below



Eugene Montalvo

Date: 10 APRIL 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Robert Andrew Alford et al.

Serial No. 10/500,316

Filed June 28, 2004

METHOD FOR INTERCONNECTING  
TUBULARS BY FORGE WELDING

Group Art Unit: 1725

Examiner: Michael Aboagye

April 10, 2006

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED 11 JANUARY 2006**

Dear Sir:

Attorney for Applicant in the above-captioned application hereby responds to the Office Action mailed 11 January 2006. At the time the Office Action issued, claims 1 to 21 were pending.

The response amends the specification, claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 19, 21 and adds new claims 22 to 24. That brings the total number of claims to four in excess of the number of 20, three more than already paid for. The total number of independent claims is one in excess of 3.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the corresponding claim fee to Deposit Account No. 19-1800.

Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 19

In Numbered paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claim 19 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moe in view of Brennan *et al.* as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Schaps *et al.* (US Pat. 5,652,389).

Attorney for Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 19 depends on Claim 1. It has been shown above that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established regarding claim 1 on the basis of Moe in view of Brennan *et al.*

The additional consideration of Schaps *et al.* does not bring a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claim 1 either, since it does not disclose a welding tool, let alone three or more electrodes for welding.

As the combination of Moe, Brennan *et al.*, and Schaps *et al.* does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claim 1, it does also not establish the case against Claim 19, for this claim contains the subject matter of Claim 1.

Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Concluding remarks

Numbered paragraph 10 of the Office Action states prior art made of record but not relied upon. Applicant will not comment on these references before they are actually applied to one or more of the claims.

In conclusion, Attorney has thus addressed each and every ground for objection and rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Attorney respectfully submits that the specification, drawings, and claims – new and amended – are now in a state ready for allowance.

In the event the Examiner has any questions or issues regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned prior to the issuance of any written action.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Andrew Alford *et al.*

By: 

Attorney, Eugene R. Montalvo  
Registration No. 32,790  
(713) 241-0296 Telephone  
(713) 241-6617 Facsimile

P. O. Box 2463  
Houston, Texas 77252-2463